

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 13 recites that the answer to a question asked is added to a knowledge database; however, there is no antecedent basis for this claim in the specification.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: the recitation "each registered student" lacks antecedent basis in the claim due to the amendment to the preamble of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 13, 20, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In reference to Claim 13

For the purposes of examination, the examiner has interpreted the applicant's recitation of "the answer to a question" to refer to the answer to a question that was not

found in the knowledge database and was supplied to the student from the lecturer via the operator/consultant. However, this cannot be ascertained with absolute certainty since the applicant does not distinguish which answer is being referred to.

In reference to Claim 20

5. The term "conducted in a traditional way" in claim 20 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "examination" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The methodology that constitutes a "traditional way" is not concretized, but rather changes, and as such, the term renders the claim indefinite.

In reference to Claims 31-32

6. Regarding claims 31-32, the phrase "and other dynamic information" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "and other dynamic information"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent Application No: US 2001/0034016 to Ziv-el et al.

(Ziv-el) in view of US Patent Application Publication No: US 2002/0187462 to

Mariappan (Mariappan) and US Patent No: US 6,091,930 to Mortimer et al. (Mortimer).

In reference to Claims 1-3, 20-21, 26-28

Ziv-el teaches a method of distance learning using at least one education center server (Figure 12, elements 345, 348, 352) comprising software for database management, data transfer and communication amongst the education system users; the education center further comprising an educational platform (par. 0010) comprising software for conducting on-line education lessons. Ziv-el also teaches the establishing at least one interactive on-line session of electronic workshops for each module, the at least one interactive session being established through an educational platform containing a website, and the at least one interactive session including a presentation to the students by the lecturer of the workshop material, submitting to the students questions and exercises to resolve (par. 0010-0011), checking and discussing by the lecturer of the exercises' solutions and a group discussion among students, with use of remote communication means (par. 0065).

Ziv-el, however, fails to teach dividing an educational program into several education levels, of which each level includes at least one module, the at least one module corresponding in its contents to a subject of a traditional education,

providing a student with at least one electronic data carrier including a workshop material and a multi-media electronic textbook for independent study, and with an access password to the educational platform,

activating electronic consultations between the students and the lecturers, following the termination of each interactive session of the electronic workshops, with the use of remote communication means;

providing each student following the termination of a predetermined session, with a subject of a test work for individual preparation and submission of a test work report to educational platform at a predetermined time; or

conducting a final examination for each module.

Mariappan teaches;

dividing an educational program into several education levels (par. 0010, ll. 1-4), of which each level includes at least one module (par. 0047), the at least one module corresponding in its contents to a subject of a traditional education [claim 2],

providing a student with at least one electronic data carrier (par. 0025, ll. 1-3) including a workshop material (par. 0048, ll. 4-8) and with an access password to the educational platform (par. 0028),

activating electronic consultations between the students and the lecturers with the use of remote communication means (par. 0039),

providing each student following the termination of a predetermined session, with a subject of a test work for individual preparation and submission of a test work report to educational platform (par. 0048 & par. 0053); and

conducting a final examination for each module (par. 0053) [claims 20-21].

Mortimer teaches the use of a multi-media electronic textbook for independent study (col. 6, ll. 37-42).

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known in the art to use time schedules for class registration and class commencement.

As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used a time schedule to establish an interactive on-line session in a predetermined time after student registration. This would have provided students with a guideline of when they needed to register for classes and when the classes started.

It is noted by the examiner that Mariappan does not specifically teach that the electronic consultations between the students and the lecturers are subsequent to the termination of each interactive session of the electronic workshops, rather, broadly teaching the use of electronic consultations without specifying when they occur.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have activated the electronic consultations of Mariappan subsequent to the termination of each interactive session of the electronic workshops, as claimed by the applicant, in order to have provided clarification and reinforcement of lecture material to

students after they had a chance to complete the workshop and identify the areas in which they needed clarification.

Neither Ziv-el nor Mariappan specifically teach that the duration of an interactive session of the electronic workshop is between 1 and 5 hours. However, the applicant has not disclosed that the duration of the electronic workshop provides a special advantage or utility to the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have made the duration of the session commensurate with the amount of material to be covered and with the audience of the material. This would have produced the same effect, of providing the student with sufficient time to complete the session as the applicant's claimed invention.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have made the duration of the interactive session between 1 and 5 hours as recited by the applicant since this modification would constitute a design choice which fails to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer [claim3].

Mariappan does not specifically teach that the multi-media electronic textbook and the workshop materials, or a syllabus are provided in a single CD-ROM or DVD disk.

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known in the field of education to provide a syllabus of study to a student of a particular subject, and also to provide electronic materials to a student on a CD-ROM.

By placing the syllabus, the multi-media electronic textbook and the workshop material on the same CD-ROM or DVD disk, the same result is obtained as if they were placed on separate disks. The computer would be able to download the material from the individual disks onto its memory, and as such the effect of placing them on a single disk serves mainly to provide the user with a single disk that contained more information, than with multiple disks, that would require more physical space.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have combined the syllabus, multi-media electronic textbook and the workshop material on a single CD-ROM or DVD disk since this is a matter of design choice that does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the applied prior art [claims 26-27].

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known in the art of computer electronics to provide a disk containing a didactic guide, technical instructions and software necessary to open the files contained on the disk.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided a didactic guide, technical instructions and software necessary to open the files contained on the disk with the disk of claim 27 (see rejection of claim 27 above). This would have provided the user with the capability of properly installing and using the software on a computer [claim 28].

It therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer to have provided a student with an electronic learning environment that allowed the

student to enjoy a learning experience remotely in a similar manner to traditional in-class learning experience.

In reference to Claim 11

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), and Mariappan further teaches that the electronic consultations are conducted by means of the educational platform with the use of e-mail (par. 0039), and Ziv-el teaches that the discussion group comprises the students and teachers (par. 0065).

In reference to Claims 17-18

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), and Ziv-el teaches the use of a discussion group (par. 0065).

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known in the art of teaching to host a review session prior to a final examination.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used the discussion group of Ziv-el to conduct a review session prior to a final examination in order to provide the students with a recap of the major topics that would be tested prior to them taking the test.

It would further have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have conducted the review sessions in a manner similar to the

electronic workshops in order to maintain consistent lesson delivery, and promote greater understanding by the student [claim 18].

In reference to Claim 29

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 17 (see rejection of claim 17 above), and Ziv-el further teaches that during the interactive session an interface including tool bars and at least two main windows selected from the group consisting of an information window, and action window and a dialogue window (par. 0054, and 0056).

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of US Patent No: US 6,397,036 to Thean et al. (Thean) and US Patent No: US 6,198,904 to Rosen (Rosen).

In reference to Claim 4

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), and Mariappan teaches that the workshop material is activated during the electronic workshop (par. 0033) and that the material comprises a sequence of: presentation of problems (par. 0048) a description (par. 0049), and an explanation (par. 0053). Ziv-el teaches an illustration (par. 0036) and checking of the students' understanding of the material (par. 0013). However, neither Ziv-el nor Mariappan

specifically teach the use of an actual example from an economic reality, indication of application possibilities or a recommendation for individual application.

Thean teaches the use of an actual example from an economic reality, and an indication of application possibilities (col. 6, ll. 27-40).

Rosen teaches a recommendation for individual application (col. 9, ll. 32-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Thean and Rosen with those of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer in order to provide a system that would engage the user in the learning process by providing stimulating information, testing the students' grasp of the material and recommending additional resources that would aid the student in getting a better grasp of the material.

10. Claims 5, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29, and further in view of US Patent No: US 6, 381,444 to Aggarwal et al. (Aggarwal).

In reference to Claims 5 and 10

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), and Ziv-el further teaches the presentation of workshop material to the students and student replies to lecturer questions (par. 0010-0011), submission to the students of questions and exercises to resolve (par. 0041) and the checking and discussing by the lecturer of the exercises' solutions (par. 0010 and par. 0065).

Mariappan teaches the use of a lesson summary (par. 0054). However, neither Ziv-el nor Mariappan specifically teach the discussion of the issues by the lecturer or student discussion.

Aggarwal teaches the discussion of the issues by the lecturer (col. 1, ll. 63-67 to col. 2, ll. 1-9) and student discussion (col. 4, ll. 34-39), wherein the means for the discussion is a chat (col. 6, ll. 64-67 to col. 7, ll. 1-11) [claim 10].

It is noted by the examiner that the references do not specifically teach that the workshops are broken into several independent parts but the examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known to break up the delivery of a lesson into different parts, and to assign different times to each part based on the lesson being taught and the audience being lectured.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Aggarwal with those of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer, and to have broken the workshops into independent parts in order to provide a method of learning in which the lecturer is able to present and discuss material to students, use quizzes to test the students' knowledge of the presented material, and allow the students to communicate with each other in order to foster continuous learning and sharing amongst each other.

In reference to Claim 9

Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer and Aggarwal teach the limitations of claim 5 (see rejection of claim 5 above), and Ziv-el teaches the use of a list button for saving internet addresses (par. 0048).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used the list button of Ziv-el to save the websites pertaining to the discussion of Aggarwal in order to provide future access to materials related to the issues discussed.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of US Patent No: US 6,845,361 to Dowling (Dowling).

In reference to Claim 6

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), but fail to specifically teach that the students who login after the start of a first part of the electronic workshop are directed to a waiting room and then automatically included into the electronic workshop prior to the commencement of a next part of the workshop.

Dowling teaches that a virtual waiting area may be used for students (col. 2, ll. 4-7).

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known in the art of teaching, to make students that arrive late for a class stand outside the class until there is an opportune moment for the student to enter when he/she will not disturb the lecturer or other students.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used the virtual waiting area of Dowling with Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer in order to provide a place for students that arrive late for a class stand outside the class until there is an opportune moment for the student to enter when he/she will not disturb the lecturer or other students in an electronic environment.

12. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer and Dowling as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of US Patent No: US 6, 155,840 to Sallette (Sallette).

In reference to Claims 7-8

Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer and Dowling teach the limitations of claim 6 (see rejection of claim 6 above), but they fail to teach that the waiting room is created by parallel, shifted in time running of several similar electronic workshops or that several first parts of the several similar electronic workshops are run shifted in time with respect to each of the several first parts.

Sallette teaches that several similar, concurrent workshops could be run (col. 4, II. 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have implemented the sessions of Sallette with the teachings of Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer and Dowling to have allowed the workshops of Sallette to be staggered in time so as to have allowed late participants to attend a different or complete version of the lecture as opposed to entering a partially complete session.

13. Claims 12-14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of US Patent Application No: US 2001/0034015 to Raichur et al. (Raichur).

In reference to Claims 12-14

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above) but fail to specifically teach that upon receipt of a question from a student by an operator/consultant within the electronic consultation a check is first made in a knowledge database and if the database contains an answer to the question, this answer is transmitted by the operator/consultant to the student, while in the case of a lack of an answer, the question is forwarded to a lecturer running a given module, who then transmits the answer to the operator/consultant, who then transfers the answer to the student.

Raichur teaches that upon receipt of a question from a student by an operator/consultant within the electronic consultation a check is first made in a

knowledge database and if the database contains an answer to the question; this answer is transmitted by the operator/consultant to the student (par. 0026-0041), while in the case of a lack of an answer, the question is forwarded to a lecturer running a given module, who then transmits the answer to the operator/consultant, who then transfers the answer to the student (par. 0042-0057), wherein the answer to a question is added to the knowledge database (par. 0056-0058) [claim 13].

Raichur further teaches that the lecturer may be the operator/consultant of the electronic consultations (par. 0025) [claim 14].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer with that of Raichur in order to provide a student with a system for obtaining expert answers to questions that may arise.

In reference to Claim 23

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), and Mariappan teaches that a password and login information is used to provide access to the system (par. 0028).

Raichur teaches a dynamic electronic library is created on the system (par. 0056-0058).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used the password and login information of Mariappan to allow

access to the dynamic library of Raichur in order to provide a registered user with access to a database of questions and answers.

14. Claims 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of US Patent Application No: US 2003/0180700 to Barry et al. (Barry).

In reference to Claim 15

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above) but fail to specifically teach the step of activating archived electronic workshops, the archived workshops being activated after the termination of the electronic workshop, but prior to returning the test work reports.

Barry teaches the step of activating archived electronic workshops (par. 0031).

The choice to activate the archived material as recited in the claim is not patentably different to activating the archived material at an undisclosed time, as in Barry, since there is no specifically stated utility by the applicant that by activating the archived material at the claimed time, there is a special outcome.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have activated the archived material after the workshop was completed so that one would have been able to pay attention to the workshop while it was in progress, and to have then activated the archived material

before returning the test work in order to better grasp the material in the time when there was no current workshop, or test work report to review since this is a matter of design choice that does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Barry with those of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer in order to provide the students with access to archived workshops for review and understanding.

In reference to Claim 22

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), and Ziv-el further teaches that the workshops, test works, the examination, the test work subjects and results and the examination grading are included in the web site of the educational platform which is accessible through the use of the access password and student identification (also see rejection of claim 1 above).

Barry teaches that archived electronic workshops are available to the students via an interfaced network (par. 0021).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have included the workshops, test works, examinations, test work subjects and results and the examination grading with the archived electronic workshops of Barry, on the system website to allow the users access to it from remote locations.

15. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of US Patent No: US 6,311,041 to Goodyear (Goodyear).

In reference to Claim 16

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above) and Mariappan further teaches that email is used for correspondence between the student and lecturer (par. 0039). However, neither Ziv-el nor Mariappan specifically teach that after the return of the test work report, and in a determined time, the lecturer sends the results of the test together with a commentary to the student via email.

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that it is old and well known in the art of teaching for a teacher to return the results of a test along with commentary about the results to a student after the student has received the test work report.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, for the teacher to have returned the results of a test along with commentary about the results to a student after the student had received the test work report in order to provide the student with a marked up copy of the test to better facilitate the student's understanding of the tested concepts, especially in the case of a multiple choice test.

The specific time frame in which the teacher takes to return the results and commentary of the test to the student has not been disclosed to add a specific utility by the applicant, and as such provides the same results as returning the test results and

commentary at an arbitrary time after the test work report has been returned that is suitable to the teacher and student.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have returned the test scores and commentary at a predetermined time since this is interpreted as a matter of design choice that does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record.

Goodyear teaches that instructors communicate grades to students by posting student grades to a website (col. 7, ll. 21-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Goodyear, in order to allow the communication of grades, as taught by Goodyear, to be via an email, in order to maintain the privacy of each student and their respective score.

16. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of US Patent No: US 6,341,212 to Shende et al. (Shende).

In reference to Claim 19

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (se rejection of claim 1 above) but neither specifically teach that a dynamic examination list that is

blocked at a predetermined time before the start of the examination is created prior to commencing the exam.

Shende teaches that a dynamic examination list is created prior to the commencement of an exam (col. 9, ll. 46-49).

The applicant fails to disclose that blocking out the list at a predetermined time provides a special utility, and the result of registering and verifying students prior to the test is the same as that obtained through the teaching of Shende.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have blocked the dynamic examination list at a predetermined time before the start of the exam in order to provide the system with ample time to verify and register the students so that the exam could proceed on schedule.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Shende with those of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer in order to allow a system to verify students prior to them taking an examination.

17. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claims 1-3, 11, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29 above, and further in view of Sallette.

In reference to Claim 24

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above) but they fail to specifically teach the step of checking, prior to the commencement of the electronic workshop session, of a student's computer's equipment and software in communication with the educational platform, the checking being made by means of test software included in the educational platform's web site wherein in the case of finding by the test software of a deficiency of software, an automatic installation of such software through the educational platform's web site follows.

Sallette teaches the checking of a user's computer, by the system, for compatibility with the system, and the provision of the required information to meet the compatibility standards (col. 5, ll. 48-64).

By performing the auto-sensing and updating prior to the commencement of an electronic workshop, as claimed by the applicant, the same result of having a compatible user system is obtained as in the auto-sensing and updating of the user computer in Sallette. It would have been desirable to complete these tasks prior to the commencement of the electronic workshop so that the students could have compatible machines and be able to participate in all of the electronic workshops.

At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have performed the auto-sensing and updating of the user computers prior to the commencement of the electronic workshops

since this is considered a matter of design choice that does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of Sallette.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the auto-sensing and updating of Sallette with the system of Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer in order to ensure that all of the students' computers were capable of allowing the students to participate in the electronic workshops.

18. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Rosen, Shende, US Patent No: US 6,347,333 to Eisendrath et al. (Eisendrath) and US Patent No: US 6,341,960 to Frasson et al. (Frasson).

In reference to Claim 30

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 29 (see rejection of claim 29 above) and Ziv-el teaches that the action window presents an educational material concerning the issues discussed by the lecturer (par. 0054).

Secondly, Mariappan teaches the presentation of chat and email (par. 0039 and 0042).

Thirdly, Mortimer teaches the presentation of the electronic textbook (col. 6, ll. 37-42).

However, they all fail to specifically teach that the information window presents complementary information relating to the material discussed or that the dialogue

window presents a syllabus, an index of key notions, definitions and formulas or a calculator.

Rosen teaches the presentation of complementary information relating to the material discussed (col. 10, ll. 9-15) and the presentation of an index of key notions (col. 10, ll. 15-42).

Shende teaches the presentation of formulas (col. 6, ll. 41-44).

Eisendrath teaches the presentation of a syllabus (col. 6, ll. 49-53) and a calculator (col. 10, ll. 12-20).

Frasson teaches the presentation of definitions (par. 0050).

None of the cited references specifically teach the name of the specific window in which the information is presented, however, the name of the window does not affect the presentation of the material in the window. To this end, the recitation of which window the information is displayed in is interpreted as non-functional descriptive material that fails to further patentably limit the claim.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer, Rosen, Shende, Eisendrath and Frasson in order to provide a system with capabilities to promote the learning of a student.

In reference to Claim 31

Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer, Rosen, Shende, Eisendrath and Frasson teach the limitations of claim 30 (see rejection of claim 30 above), and Mortimer further teaches

the presentation of 3-D animations, 2-D illustrations, layouts, diagrams and text (Figure 5 and col. 23, ll. 16-18), and calculations (col. 6, ll. 39-42).

In reference to Claim 32

Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer, Rosen, Shende, Eisendrath and Frasson teach the limitations of claim 30 (see rejection of claim 30 above), and Mortimer further teaches the presentation of video with an individual discussing an issue (col. 7, ll. 22-26).

19. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Eisendrath.

In reference to Claim 33

Ziv-el, Mariappan and Mortimer teach the limitations of claim 29 (see rejection of claim 29 above), and Ziv-el further teaches that the tool bars comprise communication buttons and links (par. 0059-0061) and the use of the internet (par. 0054). Mortimer teaches the use of an electronic textbook (col. 6, ll. 37-42) and a glossary (col. 23, ll. 19-23). However, none of the references specifically teach a syllabus or a calculator.

Eisendrath teaches the use of a syllabus (col. 6, ll. 49-53) and a calculator (col. 10, ll. 12-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used the links and buttons of Ziv-el to have included the functionality

of Mortimer and Eisendrath in order to provide a system with the capability to interact locally and online, and to provide materials for encouraging student learning.

In reference to Claim 34

Ziv-el, Mariappan, Mortimer and Eisendrath teach the limitations of claim 33 (see rejection of claim 33 above), and Ziv-el further teaches that individual communication and recall buttons are enabled or disabled in various phases of the electronic workshop (par. 0060).

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JERRY-DARYL FLETCHER whose telephone number is (571)270-5054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 6:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kathleen Mosser/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/J.D.F./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714